

FACSIMILE

DATE:

August 17, 2005

TO:

U.S. Patent & Trademark Office

FAX NO.:

(571) 273-8300

FROM:

Steven M. Freeland, Reg. No. 42,555

Attomey Docket No.:

68570/7236

U.S. Application No.:

09/649,215

Filing Date:

August 28, 2000

Inventor:

Lamkin, et al.

Art Unit:

2124

Examiner:

Vu. Tuan A.

NO. OF PAGES:

6 pages (including this 1-page coversheet)

DISPATCHED BY:

Steven M. Freeland

Transmitted herewith for filing via facsimile:

Transmittal Form (1 pg.); and

Examiner Interview Summary per 37 CFR 1.133(b) (4 pgs)

The documents accompanying this facsimile transmittal cover sheet contain information from the law firm of Fitch, Even, Tabin & Flannery which may be confidential and/or legally privileged. The documents are intended only for the personal and confidential use of the addressee identified above. If you are not the intended recipient or an agent responsible for delivering these documents to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, disclosure, copying, distribution or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this transmitted information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this facsimile in error, please immediately notify the Firm so that we can arrange for the return of the original documents to us. Thank you.

9276 Scranton Road, Suite 250 San Diego, California 92121-7701 Telephone 858-552-1311 Fax 858-552-0095

424932v1

PTC/SB/21 (09-04)
Approved for use through 07/31/2008. OMB 0851-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. Inder the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond Application Number 09/649,215 Filing Date August 28, 2000 TRANSMITTAL First Named Inventor **FORM** Lamkin, et al. Art Unit 2124 Examiner Name Vu, Tuan A. (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing) Attorney Docket Number 68570/7236 Total Number of Pages in This Submission **ENCLOSURES** (Check all that apply) After Allowance Communication to TC Fee Transmittal Form Drawing(s) Appeal Communication to Board Licensing-related Papers of Appeals and Interferences Fee Attached Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) **|** Petition Amendment/Reply (4 pgs) Petition to Convert to a Proprietary Information After Final Provisional Application Power of Attorney, Revocation Status Letter Affidavits/declaration(s) Change of Correspondence Address Other Endosure(s) (please Identify Terminal Disclaimer **Extension of Time Request** below): Request for Refund Express Abandonment Request 1) Fax Cover Sheet (1 pg.) CD, Number of CD(s) Information Disclosure Statement Landscape Table on CD Remarks Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) Customer No. 22242 Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT Firm Name Fitch, Even, Tabln & Flannery Signature Printed name Sleven M. Freeland Rea. No. Date 42.555 August 17, 2005 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below: Signature

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Bex 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SENIO FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SENIO TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date

August 17, 2005

424928v1

Typed or printed name

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Steven M. Freetand

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 1 7 2005

Attorney Docket No. 68570/7236

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s): Lamkin et al.

Serial No.:

09/649,215

Filed:

August 28, 2000

For:

SOFTWARE ENGINE FOR COMBINING VIDEO OR AUDIO CONTENT WITH PROGRAMMATIC CONTENT

Group Art

Unit:

2124

Examiner:

Vu, Tuan A.

Customer No.:

22242

Conf. No.:

7416

CERTIFICATE OF

TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this date:

Reg. No. 42.555

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY PER 37 CFR §1.133(b)

Mail Stop AMENDMENT Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Applicants thanks Examiner Tuan Vu for participating in Applicants' initiated telephonic Examiner Interview with Applicants' Representative on August 9, 2005. Per 37 CFR \$1.133(b), the following is a summary of the Examiner interview conducted on August 9, 2005 via telephone between Steven M. Freeland, Attorney of Record, and Examiner Vu. No exhibits or demonstrations were presented. The 35 U.S.C. \$103 rejection of claims 1-10 based on U.S. Patent No. 5,909,551 (Tahara et al.)

App. No. 09/649,215 Examiner Interview Summary Page 2 of 4

were discussed. There were no claim amendments suggested during the interview.

Applicants requested the Examiner clarify the grounds for rejection as Applicants and their representatives had difficulty in accurately following the logic of the Examiner's rejection. Examiner Vu elaborated on the rejection stating that "buttons" referencing FIG. 26 of Tahara were equivalent to variables, and that previously provided HTML content associated with that "button" is equivalent to a definition to the "button" variable.

Applicants' representative demonstrated that a "button 2607" according to the Tahara patent was not equivalent to a variable, and that previously generated HTML content was not a "definition" as claimed. Further, Applicants' representative demonstrated that Taraha does not teach or suggest at least "replacing the variable with the definition for the variable" as claimed. Examiner Vu indicated that by a user selecting the "button" Taraha described linking to the already provided content, referring to FIG. 24 of Tahara. However, Applicants' representative pointed out that the pending claims do not recite "linking" but instead recite "searching the source file for the variable, and replacing the variable with the definition for the variable" (see claim 1, for example).

Examiner Vu further equated the displaying of the already provided linked content as equivalent to the claimed "generating programmatic content." However, the Tahara patent does not describe "generating programmatic content", and instead only describes linking or shifting between already provided content. Applicants' representative further demonstrated that the Tahara patent fails to describe "replacing the variable with

App. No. 09/649,215 Examiner Interview Summary Page 3 of 4

the definition" as claimed, and instead only describes shifting to linked content.

Still further, Applicants representative demonstrated that the Tahara patent did not teach "generating programmatic content in response to the searching". Examiner Vu indicated that the Tahara patent described displaying the linked HTML. However, Applicants' representative pointed out that displaying the previously provided linked content is not equivalent to generating programmatic content, and further is not generating programmatic content in response to the searching. The Examiner suggested that the Tahara patent described using tags, and the tags were replaced with content, by linking the "button" to content. Again, there is no suggestion in Tahara to generate programmatic content in response to the searching as Tahara only describes linking or shifting between displays. Applicants' representative pointed out to the Examiner that the Examiner's logic disassociated the claim limitations effectively ignoring the relationship between the claim limitations, for example, by ignoring that the programmatic content is generated in response Therefore, Applicants' representative to the searching. demonstrated that Tahara did not teach or make obvious the limitations as claimed in at least independent claim 1.

No agreement was reached during the interview. However, it remains clear that the cited reference fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the claims as set forth by Applicants as required under applicable law.

App. No. 09/649,215 Examiner Interview Summary Page 4 of 4

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicants submit that the applied reference does not teach or make the pending claims obvious. Therefore, claims 1-10 are in condition for allowance

Respectfully submitted,

Steven M. Freeland Reg. No. 42,555

Dated: 8-/7 - 05

Address all correspondence to: FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY Thomas F. Lebens 120 South LaSalle Street, Ste. 1600 Chicago, IL 60603 (858) 552-1311

424058_1